

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0110400 of *Cartmell et al.* ("*Cartmell*").

Claims 7, 9, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Cartmell* and U.S. Patent No. 6,195,698 of *Lillibridge et al.* ("*Lillibridge*").

Claim 5 is cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-14 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The examiner has stated that claims 1-14 recite abstract ideas without practical application. (Page 2, Office Action, 1-12-2006). Applicant submits that the limitations in amended claims 1-4 and 6-14 provide a practical application in the technological arts and therefore satisfy 35 U.S.C. §101. For example, amended claim 1 includes the limitation of generating a web form that enables creation of a user account for a computer-related service. It is submitted that generating a web form that enables creation of a user account for a computer-related service as claimed in amended claim 1 is a practical application in the technological arts.

The examiner has rejected claims 15-20 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The examiner has stated that claims 15-20 are directed to nonfunctional descriptive material. (Page 2, Office Action, 1-12-2006). In response, applicant has amended claims 15-20 to include limitations similar to the limitations in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that the limitations in amended claims 15-20 provide a

practical application in the technological arts and therefore satisfy 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Cartmell* because *Cartmell* does not disclose a question that is selected to exercise a human common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Cartmell* discloses a question that exercises a word counting capability (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0018, lines 20-21) and a question that exercises a color recognition capability (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0018, line 21) and a question that exercises knowledge of the current U.S. President (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0018, lines 21-22) and a question that exercises a capability to recognize a semantic error in a sentence (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0027, line 18) and a question that exercises a capability to recognize a word contained in a distorted image (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0027, lines 18-19) and a question that exercises a capability to recognize a word presented audibly (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0027, line 20). None of these capabilities tested by *Cartmell* anticipate testing a human common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claim 1. Examples of questions that exercise a common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claim 1 include "Can [a horse] jump over fences?" and "Can [a horse] fly over mountains?" (See page 7, lines 12-27 of Applicant's specification).

Applicant also submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Cartmell* because *Cartmell* does not disclose generating a web form that enables creation of a user account for a computer-related service as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Cartmell* teaches generating a web page that authorizes email to be sent to a recipient. (*Cartmell*, paragraph 0018, lines 31-33 and paragraph 27, lines 1-2). It is submitted that

an authorization for email transmission as taught by *Cartmell* does not anticipate creating a user account as claimed in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2-4 and 6-14 depend from amended claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-4 and 6-14 are not anticipated by *Cartmell*.

Applicant also submits that amended claim 15 is not anticipated by *Cartmell*. Amended claim 15 includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1 including a question that is selected to exercise a human common sense reasoning capability. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 1 and *Cartmell* also apply to amended claim 15.

Given that claims 16-20 depend from amended claim 15, it is submitted that claims 16-20 are not anticipated by *Cartmell*.

It is also submitted that claims 7, 9, 14, and 18 are not obvious in view of *Cartmell* and *Lillibridge* because claims 7, 9, 14, and 18 depend from amended claims 1 and 15 and because *Cartmell* and *Lillibridge* do not disclose or suggest a question that is selected to exercise a human common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claims 1 and 15. Applicant has shown that *Cartmell* does not disclose a question that is selected to exercise a human common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claims 1 and 15. *Lillibridge* discloses random strings that are visually or audibly distorted (*Lillibridge*, Abstract) rather than a question that is selected to exercise a human common sense reasoning capability as claimed in amended claims 1 and 15.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-12-06

By: Paul H. Horstmann  
Paul H. Horstmann  
Reg. No.: 36,167